

REMARKS

The claims have been amended to more clearly define the invention as disclosed in the written description. In particular, claims 2, 3, 6 and 9 have been cancelled, while claims 1, 5 and 8 have been amended to include the limitations of cancelled claims 2 and 3. In addition, claim 11 has been made a proper multiple dependent claim depending from claim 8 or 10, while claim 12 has been made a proper singularly dependent claim depending from claim 1. Furthermore, the claims have been amended for clarity.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 5, 8, 11 and 12/1 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being unpatentable (anticipated?) by U.S. Patent 5,434,834 to Shinoda et al. The Examiner has further rejected claims 2, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10 and 12/2 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shinoda et al. in view of U.S. Patent 6,631,892 to Bakx. Applicants acknowledge that the Examiner has found claim 3 allowable over the prior art of record.

In view of the above changes, Applicants believe that the Examiner's 35 U.S.C. 102(b) and 103(a) rejections have been overcome.

Applicants believe that this application, containing claims 1, 4, 5, 7, 8 and 10-12, is now in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

by /Edward W. Goodman/  
Edward W. Goodman, Reg. 28,613  
Attorney  
Tel.: 914-333-9611